26th March 1929] [Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.]

be made to these schemes. Of course, if I am not going on an indelicate ground, we people who are agitating for separating the Andhra districts into a separate province have to object. Another reason is that most of the money that is now sanctioned for this scheme will be spent in purchasing machinery in England. The complaint about the Mettur project has been that there has not been sufficient advertisement in the papers on the Continent and America and that the special officer has been sent direct to England for purchasing all the machinery there. These electrical schemes are naturally of huge machinery, and in the present circumstances this money is being spent by the executive which is not responsible to the Legislature. It is expected that these sums will be spent for the benefit of the British manufacturers at great loss to the taxpayer of this country. The machinery is known to be cheaper and at least as efficient on the Continent and also in America than in England and therefore any risk of benefiting the manufacturers of Great Britain to the detriment of the Indian taxpayer has also to be avoided. Therefore, I think that any money to be spent on these electric schemes would be a waste or at any rate will not be so useful as they would be if the schemes are postponed till we get full responsible Government. I would therefore object to the taking up of the scheme at this stage."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I have very little to add. As a matter of fact my friend Mr. Swami Nayudu opposed the motion for the grant itself when the demand for the hydro-electric scheme came before the House and Mr. Wood on that occasion and my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar on that occasion as well as on the present occasion and my friend Mr. Gopala Menon on the present occasion have answered all the criticisms. I do not think there is any necessity to spend more time of the Council in my answering to the objection now raised."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

III

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1928-29.

GRANT XXVII—FISHERIES—TRANSFERRED. 12-30 p.m.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding* Rs. 16,380 *under Grant XXVII—Fisheries—Transferred*'."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"I second it."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXIV—AGENCY TRACTS—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding* Rs. 100 *under Grant XXXIV—Agency Tracts—Reserved*'.

"Sir, this is a token demand for obtaining the approval of the House for certain works being undertaken in regard to urgent repairs to the roof of

the prisoners' wards in the District Jail, Koraput. The money can be met by appropriation but as the work is a new work, this token grant has to be moved."

The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" I second it."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXVI—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'*that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXXVI—Loans and Advances by Provincial Government.*'

" Sir, this is a token grant in order to give a loan of Rs. 24,000 to the Board of Commissioners for Hindu Religious Endowments. It has not been found possible for these Commissioners—this has been pointed out in the explanatory note that has been circulated to the Members—to collect enough money to carry on the administration of the Board. The Board has promised that, as far as this loan is concerned, they will repay it within six months with interest. Under these circumstances I hope hon. Members will have no objection to this loan being granted to the Board."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Some hon. Members have given notice of token cuts. One of them is by Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai to discuss the necessity for appointing depressed class members to temple committees. Another is by Mr. Biswanath Das to discuss the work of the Commissioners and for other purposes. The third is by Mr. K. R. Karant as to the necessity of having more than one committee for South Kanara I have just now received another notice given by Zamindar of Gollapalli to discuss the heavy machinery of the department and also to suggest simple and effective means of safeguarding the endowments. I wish to know how far these motions are relevant to this supplemental demand. In supplemental grants we have always confined ourselves to the cut motions completely relevant to the purpose of the grant. Here the Government wants to stand in the position of a creditor and the Board wants to stand in the position of a borrower. Therefore the questions relating to the Government's position to lend money and the position of the Board to borrow money are, I think, relevant matters for consideration. Before I give my ruling however if hon. Members want to convince me as to how their motions are relevant I shall be glad to hear their arguments"

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, in the first place when we have to sanction a sum of money. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" This is not sanctioning a sum of money."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I know it, Sir. I am coming to the question of sanction. Sir, a sum of money, be it either borrowing."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" This is only borrowing. . ."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I know, I know. I am coming to my point.

" Sir, even if it is a question of borrowing, there are cases where the Government have come forward with motions to write off portions or full

26th March 1929] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

sums of money and in some cases for remission of interest also. This Hindu Religious Endowments Board, I think, was granted a sum exceeding 2 lakhs of rupees just three years back and we have heard nothing about that sum."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"We have heard of that sum in the explanatory note to the supplemental demand."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Excepting this supplemental demand I do not think we have ever heard anything about the previous loan. Nor have we heard of any action being taken about the realization of that loan by the Government on the one hand or of its payment by the Board on the other. In these circumstances we have no option but to come forward with these motions to discuss how far the Board would be able to pay back the money and whether or not it is desirable to give again to the Board a further sum and if so, what is the security for the money to be given."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"All these things are for consideration of the House. But your motion relates to the activities of the Board regarding their own functions."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Because I want to refer to them to show how they effect collection."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I never doubted about the question of collection being raised in this discussion. Their negligence in collecting can be questioned. Their business capacity can be questioned."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"With due submission to you, Sir, I have to bring to the notice of this House the work of the Commissioners in its various aspects. While referring to the collection of its dues, we have to refer to the rate of interest that is levied as also the register of endowments that will have to be kept by the Board as laid down in the Act. This is very essential because if they have kept the register we could easily find out what are the assets and liabilities of the Board. It is a statutory obligation on the Board that they should keep a register of endowments, but they have not fulfilled this obligation. I think it is incumbent on the hon. Members of this House to take this aspect of the matter into consideration. The question of provident fund which I have referred to in my motion may not be very necessary and I have no objection to give it up. The other things are essential and I think we should have to refer to them. Therefore I submit that the cut motion is in order."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I have given this point my best consideration. The only point relevant to the discussion is the solvency of the Board and its capacity to collect the money and also to discharge this debt. Any discussion beyond this will not be relevant and therefore the token cuts as proposed are not relevant except that of Mr. K. V. R. Swami. Even there I would suggest to him to oppose the grant itself because the principles involved are the same as what he wants to discuss, viz , the negligence of the Board in not collecting the amounts due to it. Whether the Board should be taken as a safe debtor is the relevant point for consideration and therefore he may oppose the grant and may adduce all the reasons. After all this is a token demand."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" If my motion is disallowed it is all right. But if it is not disallowed I wish to move it. If my motion is carried, it would mean that the Board ought to do better work and not sleep as they have been doing in the past."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I would suggest to hon. Members that if this motion is carried it means that the purpose for which this grant is asked for is not accepted by the House."

(Voices : 'So the loan may be given.')

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The object of this cut motion is to discuss the neglect of the Religious Endowments Board in not collecting its dues. That means that the Board is not in a position to borrow on account of its negligence."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" My own opinion is that if this cut motion is passed it only means that this House is of opinion that the Board is not carrying out its duties and that they are not collecting their dues properly. With all that the House may not refuse the grant and may give another chance to the Board to show better work and if it does not turn out better work it will refuse the grant next time. So the object of this cut motion is simply to make the Board bestir themselves and do better work. So, Sir, I beg to move that this allotment of Rs. 100 be reduced by Re. 1.

"Sir, my object in moving this motion is this: that we are quite convinced that this Board is not doing any good work at all. They are satisfied with writing the report and complimenting themselves with the various activities they have undertaken during last year. A sum of 3 lakhs of rupees was lent to the Board some two years back and they were supposed to pay it by instalments. They could not pay even one instalment. The first instalment had to be paid on 1st May 1928 and another in the month of March 1928 and so on. Out of the moneys lent to them to the extent of 3 lakhs they have to pay up to date Rs. 1,26,695. They have not paid a pie and they have come again to this House with another application for lending them moneys. They have to collect to the extent of 7 lakhs of rupees and they have neglected to collect a lot of moneys. They have collected only Rs. 2,46,000. Out of the 7 lakhs due to them there is still a balance of Rs. 4,29,000 and odd. When they have yet to collect to the extent of 4 lakhs of rupees they have come before this House for a loan of Rs. 24,000. My belief is that they have not done their duty properly. If they had done their duties in sufficient time, they need not have resorted to make these applications. Perhaps they thought it was an easier method for them to come to the Government and ask for loans than taking any trouble to collect the moneys due to them. In their annual report at page 36 they say referring to coercive process 'the filing of applications in courts under section 70 is attended with various difficulties as set forth in the Board's letter . . . and so on.' They were given this special privilege because it was thought that by simply filing the application they should be enabled to execute their demands. That is the simplest process that can be given to anybody. Yet they did not avail themselves of this process and tell us it was beset with various difficulties. The only thing that is not beset with any difficulty for them seems to be to put in applications for loans to this Government time and again. That is the process they have found out to be very easy. Now at the close of the fasli under report, they say, 'the

inspecting officers of the Board have been directly authorized by the Board to collect contributions on their giving satisfactory security to the Board.' That is the process they have adopted after three years. After three years they have found out that they have to authorize the inspectors to collect the money provided they give some security. Still the matter is pending, but the inspectors, if they so choose, will have to collect the money after giving the security first.

"Of course, that is a sound rule. At the end of three years they have found that they are not able to collect the money due to them; they say that 12-15 p.m. the collections will be made later on. It is stated that the actual and direct collection of arrears was entrusted to these officers only recently. Only recently they came to the conclusion that the money should be collected and they have entrusted this work to these officers. My fear is this, Mr. President. This Board is asking money now; it is stated that it will be repaid. The hon. Minister also stated that this Board has undertaken to repay this amount. He did not tell us why they have not fulfilled the promises made by them previously. Perhaps there was not a good case for the hon. Minister to make out. The Board has made many promises before. It is indebted to the Government to the extent of rupees one lakh and a quarter. He simply said that this money would be repaid; I very much doubt it. Some time later the Board will say that it cannot pay this amount and it will ask the Government to write off this loan. That is the easiest way for it for getting over the difficulty. At page 38 of the report the Board says 'the Board is hardly able to keep its work going and with the contributions that are likely to be realized, it will not be possible for it to repay the loans at all and the Government have accordingly been requested to write them off.' This piece of information was withheld from us purposely. The Board is saying now 'please pay Rs. 24,000 now; afterwards I shall send an application to have this amount written off. The hon. the Chief Minister expects the amount to be paid with interest. Under these circumstances, I request the House to support this cut motion. These people went to sleep for three years and they woke up at the end of three years. The Board must be told that what it has been doing is not at all proper, and that it has no right to ask for a further loan before it explains why it has not paid the previous instalments. With these words I move this cut motion."

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to second the motion."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, Sir, you were pleased to rule my motion out of order under the Standing Orders of this Council, a procedure which appears to be more rigid than that of the House of Commons. I would request you to give us some more latitude since a token motion is brought forward and not a total grant. The Religious Endowments Act came into operation in the year 1925 and the Board of Commissioners were appointed shortly afterwards. If the Government had taken pains to select proper candidates, the work of the Board could have been done more easily, conveniently and, need I add, efficiently. It is not my purpose to say that the Board is unnecessary and I do not say so. Without meaning any offence to anybody, I have to say that some of the Commissioners cannot justify their existence. With regard to Circars, so long as Mr. Surya Rao was there, the trouble was not keen. Now we have another gentleman, immediately follows a number of cases. They must know how

to adjust themselves; they must know how to administer the religious endowments and to put them in order and must be able to chalk out a line for efficient management."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am trying my best to understand how the remarks of the hon. Member are relevant to the motion under discussion."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Because collection depends upon these facts."

* The hon the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is requested to come to the question of collections very soon."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I say it is therefore time that the selection of these Commissioners be left to the Public Services Commission. Sir, trustees have been appointed without due consideration of the needs of the temples or of the wishes of the people and the result is there has been chaos, chaos at present where there was at least an iota of order. To-day the Board comes 'forward and says we have no money; please help us'. I think we must return a blank cheque because you have not cared to manage your affairs. The Board was intended for higher purposes, and you have failed to fulfil your purpose and therefore bless yourselves.

"Even where paid trustees have been appointed, no rules of procedure have been framed. Only the Act is there; not even executive instructions are given. The Board has power to frame by-laws and the Government have power to frame rules. If Government had framed rules and laid down procedure, it would have led to efficient collection. In my district a number of temples and matams have been brought under the control of the Board and trustees have been appointed for these temples and maths. The result is that the management is worse than what the matadhipathis were doing. For the last $1\frac{1}{2}$ years it is going from bad to worse since Mr. Surya Rao handed over charge. To quote instances, we have the Kullada temples as also the Haradakhandy Math. A trustee has been appointed on Rs. 300 for the Haradakhandy Math besides a costly establishment which gets an income of Rs. 1,40,000. They have no idea as to where the money is to be kept in custody. Why not keep the amount in some bank or in the Post office? Otherwise it will lead to immense mischief. Rules must be framed or executive instructions should be given as to the custody of these moneys, and also for proper leasing out of the properties. The Religious Endowments Board say now that we have not realised any money; the only reply we can give is 'bless yourself'. I was told that the Board asked for a sum of Rs 50,000. I do not find any reason why the Government should give them only Rs. 24,000 when they really want Rs 50,000. If you are convinced of the real necessities that the Board require Rs. 50,000, by all means give them that amount. Let them have their existence. Give them necessary funds and let them have a chance to justify our expectations under the able guidance of Mr. Reddi who was for a long time our colleague here. I was told that about sixty appeals were pending before the High Court. If the Government come to the conclusion after examination that the Board have to get some money and if the payment of the sum of Rs 50,000 will put them in the way to repay not only this amount but also the sum of Rs. $2\frac{1}{3}$ lakhs already borrowed, by all means the Government should pay them a sum of Rs. 50,000. Want of money paralyses the activities of any institution. The Board often fails to pay the Commissioners and sometimes the unfortunate clerks.

26th March 1929] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

"Temple committees are agents of the Board under the Act, and they can be relied upon for efficient collection work. The constitution of these temple committees has been far from satisfactory. That is one reason why we are unwilling to give the power of nomination to the Government. I know from my experience of my district—and I have heard from several hon. Members of various parties stating that the nominations are not properly made and hence work suffers. . ."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar :—"Is the hon. Member in order, Sir."

* Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo :—"I do not yield to the hon. Member."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar :—"May I know if the hon. Member is in order to talk about nominations when he is speaking about collections?"

* The hon. the President :—"The hon. Member tries to show that, by good nominations, collection work will be quite all right. (Laughter.)"

* Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo :—"I explained myself. I hold, Sir, that I confined myself within the four corners of your ruling. . ."

* The hon. the President :—"The hon. Member is a new Member of the Council."

* Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo :—"Sir, we wanted that these committees should have long existence so as to enable them to evolve some policy. If the hands are changed year after year, collection work must necessarily suffer. When the hon. Minister's predecessor came forward with a Bill to extend the lifetime of these committees by two years, we refused and he accepted it to have them only for one year. That is clear from page 295 of the Proceedings, dated 2nd November 1927. These committees are still there. If any temple trustee takes it into his head that the existence of these committees is illegal, I think there will be far more litigation than what we have now. If the hon. Minister does not make up his mind and come forward with an amending Bill, the temple committees and the Board will revert to the state of things in 1926."

* Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi :—"Mr. President, Sir, however irrelevant some of the remarks of my hon. Friends on this side of the House might be . . ." 1 p.m.

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao :—"May I rise to a point of order. Is the judgment of irrelevancy in the President or in the Members, Sir?"

* The hon. the President :—"The hon. Member has not submitted it to the ruling of the Council. He is only expressing his view of the question."

* Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi :—"I wish to make a few observations with a view to clearing a misapprehension on the part of certain hon. Members of this House. They have been telling us that collection work has been very bad. Though I am not directly connected with the collection work of this Board, I may point out that I have some knowledge of the working of these things, having been a member of the temple committee in my district. Now that the Act has been passed and given effect to, there seems to be a good deal of difficulty in convincing the trustees or owners of temples to pay off their own quota as early as possible. In certain cases, the matter had to

be taken to Court and the decisions of the Court were awaited, and even if the decision of the Court was given, the decree had to be executed and all these processes mean delay in the realization of the money. I do think that similar difficulties are felt in the Religious Endowments Board also. I have been told that all attempts are being made to realize the money as early as possible. Further for want of money they have not been able to appoint an efficient staff to collect the amounts due from the excepted temples. You know there were several cases and petitions in the High Court objecting to the very Hindu Religious Endowments Act and in a couple of years all these obstructionist methods were got over and regular work was begun. After having begun that work, during the last two years, the progress that has been made seems to be very satisfactory, but if they are running short of funds, it must be said to the discredit of the temple managers or trustees who have not been ready to pay their contributions. Further, it has to be observed that the staff is very inadequate and a district inspector or two will not be sufficient to collect all the funds that are due to the Board. The very same difficulties are being felt in the mufassal also in regard to temple committees. There are certain temples which are 'non-excepted' and which have to pay their quota both to the Board and to the temple committee of the district. They feel really that it is a burdensome task to be paying their contributions to both of them. In these circumstances, I feel that there is nothing to show that the Religious Endowments Board is not at all negligent about their duties and that they have been trying their best to collect the funds due to them. And, in course of time, I think, they will be able to maintain their office by their own funds. If we pass this demand it will be only passing a loan of Rs. 24,000 to the Board, which the Board may be able to repay in the course of a few years to repay and as such there will be no difficulty in passing this grant. The remarks of the hon. Members, that it is not at all necessary to make any such grant or that the Board has not been doing its work properly do not at all stand any argument and they are not also based upon facts."

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, I am very much indebted to the previous speaker who has replied most effectively to the points raised by hon. Friends opposite. I think your contention was that the carrying of the token cut will really mean that the total amount wanted could not be spent and only Rs. 99 will be voted as this motion is moved under the proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 32 which runs as follows :

> 'Provided that when funds to meet proposed expenditure on a new service can be made available by re-appropriation a demand for the grant of a token sum may be submitted to the vote of the Council and if the Council assents to the demand, funds may be so made available'.

" So if the Council accepts the motion of Mr. Swami Nayudu and cuts out Re. 1 out of this token demand, the amount that the Government will have to spend will be only Rs. 99 and not the amount provided for, namely, Rs. 24,000. So, the carrying out of the token cut will really mean the total rejection of the demand. That is my contention, Mr. President.

" As to the difficulties that the Board is working under, it has been pointed out ably by Mr. Ramachandra Reddi. The only way that the Board can collect funds is under section 70 of the Act, which provides that a demand should first be issued and if there is a failure to pay then it can only be recovered by recourse to litigation. Hon. Members, I believe, are aware that coercive litigation takes time and the Board are

doing their best to recover the money. As Mr. Swami Nayudu read out from the Administration Reports of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, the Board has been trying its best to get all the money realized and with all the best intentions in the world it has not succeeded in doing this. I think if they manage to do better, I am sure they will be able to repay this amount of Rs 24,000. I am not talking of the old loan at all. No decision has been come to with regard to that. Therefore, Mr President, I hope the Council will carry this demand."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I now put the motion of Mr. Swami Nayudu to the vote of the House. The question is 'to reduce the allotment of Rs. 100 by Re 1'."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—'Mr. President, I rise to oppose the grant. This is an unfortunate department which is being administered without being recognized as a department. It is an unfortunate law that is attempted to be administered and it is a more unfortunate Minister who has the charge of this particular subject. I am afraid, Sir, that we cannot accede to making this provision of giving a loan to the Religious Endowments Board without knowing exactly where we stand. It is not a mere question of debtor and a creditor. The Government have certain specific duties to perform in regard to the Religious Endowments Board. If the Endowments Board were a corporation by itself, independent in its own powers of administration, Government may be right in treating this question as a question of debtor and creditor. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister for Self-Government is also in charge of this portfolio and he has the thumb over the Religious Endowments Board. We have heard from the speech made by my hon. Friend from Godavari and also from the hon. the Chief Minister himself that the Religious Endowments Board has a great many difficulties to contend against. I feel that it has very many difficulties to contend against and the gravest difficulty is the hon. Minister himself. The reason is obvious. The question of considering the relationship between the Religious Endowments Board, the Act under which it works and the Government which administer this particular subject, has been before the country for a very long time . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. The hon. Member is launching on a very big subject as to the relationship of the Minister to the Religious Endowments Board. I may tell him he is not at all in order. The only question he will be allowed to discuss is whether the Government will stand in the position of creditor and allow the Religious Endowments Board to continue as its debtor."

* Mr. G HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"I want, Sir, that the Government should not allow the Religious Endowments Board to continue any longer as debtor. If the Government has courage in itself let it undertake the whole burden and carry it on as a department of its own. Let it not give the Board a bad name and hang it If the Government endorses the view that the Board should be permitted to draw loans from the Government what really happens is that the Board gets all the blame and the hon Minister all the praise. That is what is being done in the name of the Board. The Commissioners of the Board are poor people—they are not poor in the matter of pay, but they are poor in regard to their powers—and are put to very great difficulties in the matter of collection, and they are asked to carry on

[Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao.] [26th March 1929

the administration. If what the hon. Member from Ganjam has stated is true, the Minister cuts off even the loan which this Board wants for its own purposes and here is a spectacle of a corporation carrying on business under the direction of a Minister and begging loans. I do not understand the real import of a loan being granted to the Endowments Board. If the Government takes it into its head to take up the administration of the whole department itself, let them do so and come before us for money to spend on that department and then there would be efficiency there. If the Government on the other hand think that the Endowments Board should shift for itself, let them say so, and allow the Board to cancel or to annul itself. There is no good playing hide-and-seek in this matter and let us have a clear statement from the Government as to its intentions. It is no good telling us that the Religious Endowments Board will be able, after six months, to pay this amount of Rs. 24,000 with interest or free of interest. What is the interest that the Government is going to charge on this loan ?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent."

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Yes, $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. But, why should a corporation that carries on the business of the Government for the better administration of the country be charged with such an interest as that, I do not understand at all, except it be that the hon. Minister wants to be safe without being disturbed with regard to the details of administration. I do not know if the theory has been started as in the excise policy. I do not know whether the hon. Minister will ere long start the theory that it is a corporation independently working and that this House has no control and that he cannot answer any questions or interpellations that we may ask. Unless Government makes up its mind to act clearly and definitely, I do not see any reason for them to come before this House with this token cut. A token cut is a dangerous matter. It makes the Corporation's position humiliating. The hon. Minister has to-day chosen to give them a loan of Rs. 24,000, he wants us to concede to the principle of giving a loan and to grant this token cut. I do not know whether there is anything that will prevent the Minister from giving more or less or bargaining with the Religious Endowments Board, with regard to the details of the loan, details of the interest and for using the Board in a manner not very conducive to the interests of the country. I do not want that the Board should be a beggar at the door of the Government or of the Minister. I therefore feel that this grant should not be made."

1-15 p.m. The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I take it the House is ready for a vote. The question is that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXXVI—Loans and Advances by Provincial Government."

The motion was put and carried and the grant made.

IV

MADRAS SERVICES COMMISSION BILL—SITTINGS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE AT OOTACAMUND.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Sir I beg to move—

' *That this Council authorizes the Select Committee appointed by it to report on the Madras Services Commission Bill (Bill No. 5 of 1929) to hold its sittings at Ootacamund to consider the Bill and to draft the report*'.

" The Select Committee is not likely to sit till after the 15th April. I therefore submit that the balance of convenience will certainly be in favour of